DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 803 EA 029 945

AUTHOR Erkkila, Kristiina
TITLE Ways of Seeing the Entrepreneurial Education Debates in the United States, the United Kingdom and Finland.
PUB DATE 1999-04-13
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999). Small print in some figures may not reproduce clearly.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Economic Factors; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Entrepreneurship; Foreign Countries; Literature Reviews; *National Curriculum; National Surveys; Politics of Education
IDENTIFIERS Finland; United Kingdom; United States

ABSTRACT

This paper on entrepreneurial education compares positions in three national debates. It identifies different ways that formal and informal texts define entrepreneurial education and gives rationales for it--in comprehensive schools or K-12 education--in different contexts. The study was guided by three questions: (1) What is understood by entrepreneurial education in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Finland? (2) How do rationales for entrepreneurial education in the U.S., the U.K., and Finland differ? and (3) How can the discovered ways of seeing be patterned as intertextual spaces of debate? Data for the study were selected from texts in all three countries, representing a wide array of positions. Following overviews of entrepreneurial education in each of the three countries, the results of the study are presented. The findings indicate that in all three countries a free-market economy was the dominant metaphor underlying new developments in education. The educational reforms in these countries were connected to the same pressures that drove economic competition. This was particularly true in the U.S. and the U.K., where education has been blamed for failing in its mission. The report uses maps or "social cartographies" to represent each country's educational climate. (Contains 23 references and 4 figures.) (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 432 803

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Ways of seeing the Entrepreneurial Education Debates in the United States, the United Kingdom and Finland

Kristiina Erkkilä
Administration and Policy Studies in Education
University of Pittsburgh
5S01 Forbes Quadrangle
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
USA
e-mail: erkrist+@pitt.edu

Paper presented at the Business Education and Information Systems SIG at the AERA Conference
April 13, 1998, San Diego, California

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

There are many examples of a distinct entrepreneurial wave throughout the industrialized world that began and grew during the past two decades. The concept of entrepreneurship is offering today significant ideas to educational practice. A great deal of activity in entrepreneurship and enterprise education has already spread in schools and colleges. Interpretations of this activity vary by national context, but the underlying theme is teaching all students to show more imagination, initiative and readiness to be innovative. With the lack of one established term that is shared by all the discourse communities, for the purpose of this study I will call all this activity entrepreneurial education. The rationale for using this term is to enable a shared discourse across contexts.

The United States and the United Kingdom can be identified as "leaders" in entrepreneurial education. In the US entrepreneurial education has been called entrepreneurship education and has been pursued extensively for many years, extending through a wide variety of different models. Enterprise education originates from Northeast England, where it emerged from the large-scale closure of traditional industries and the ensuing high unemployment. A substantial number of programs were developed in the 1980s with the support from both public and private organizations. (Gibb, 1993, pp.11-12.) Similar changes in the society and simultaneous restructuring in the delivery of education initiated enterprise education pilot projects in Finland almost a decade later, in 1993, mainly following the models from the UK. Today Finnish educational authorities seek to expand the programs and the idea of entrepreneurial education all over the country.

The purpose of this paper is to report a study that attempts to gain better understanding of the phenomenon of entrepreneurial education by comparing positions in national debates in three different countries: the United States, the United Kingdom and Finland. The worldwide emphasis on entrepreneurship has made the discourse around entrepreneurial education in these three countries now more vivid and timely than ever before. There are a number of conflicting perspectives about the issue. However, in today's world it is essential to understand that multiple perspectives and different positions in a debate are common. This study identifies different ways texts define entrepreneurial education and give rationales for it, in comprehensive school or K-12 education, in different contexts. The study's attempt to categorize and interrelate arguments in textual discourse differs from previous studies, which portray entrepreneurial education from only one perspective, or in only one context.

The need for the presented study is primarily pragmatic, but also theoretical. Both policy makers and educators, but also the general public, certainly in Finland, but in the US and UK as well, would need a better understanding of entrepreneurial education. The more versatile presentation is needed in order to make well-informed decisions regarding entrepreneurial education policy, but also to learn more about the current global promotion of entrepreneurship. In addition, the theory and conceptualization of

entrepreneurial education will benefit from the international comparison between two leading genres of entrepreneurial education, entrepreneurship education in the US and enterprise education in the UK, and the new, beginning entrepreneurial education culture in the case of Finland.

RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

Understanding how entrepreneurial education is seen as an educational and social phenomenon is a multifaceted problem. The reported study tries to expand the vision in order to address this problematic question from multiple perspectives. First of all, it problematizes the definitions of the key concepts. The study portrays different views of the contested concepts in terms of the definition's level and goal. Second, it approaches the debate's multiple perspectives by looking at how entrepreneurial education is seen in terms of advocacy or opposition and also in terms of societal or individual implications. Within these dimensions, the study is trying to open a space for multiple voices to be heard. Additionally, one task for this study is to uncover an appropriate way to portray the findings. In the following, I will express the goals of this study in form of research questions that this study seeks to answer.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is understood by entrepreneurial education in the US, the UK and in Finland?
2. How do rationales for entrepreneurial education in the US, the UK and in Finland differ?
3. How can the discovered ways of seeing be patterned as intertextual spaces of debate?

HOW HAS ENTREPRENEURSHIP BEEN CONCEPTUALIZED?

Block and Stumpf (1992, p.18) argue that entrepreneurial education must be studied in the context of entrepreneurship research. The Finnish researcher Mahlberg (1995) maintains that this is why entrepreneurship education research should be conducted from the point of view of economics and not just from that of education. She adds that entrepreneurship education is derived from entrepreneurship research because it studies what successful entrepreneurs do, and not just what they are successful with. (Mahlberg, 1995, p. 2-3.) In this section I will briefly touch the concept of entrepreneurship.

There is no concise, universally accepted definition of an entrepreneur or of entrepreneurship. Nevertheless, there is agreement that entrepreneurs have common personality traits: initiative, creativity, risk-taking ability, enthusiasm, independence, and vision. (Noll, 1993, p. 3.) Although there is still a great confusion within the entrepreneurship discipline, Timmons presents a widely supported definition of entrepreneurship in a compact and operational form:

> Entrepreneurship is creating and building something of value from practically nothing. That is, entrepreneurship is the process of creating or seizing an opportunity and pursuing it regardless of the resources currently controlled. (Timmons, 1995, p. 5.)

The above definition, evolved in Harvard Business School and Babson College, is academic and tied to the economic disciplines. Gunderson (1990, p.47) gives a definition that seems to take a more American cultural point of view:

> Entrepreneurship is drawing from a wide range of skills capable of enhancement to add value to a targeted niche of human activity. The effort expended in finding and implementing such opportunities is rewarded by income and independence as well as pride in creation.

THE METHOD AND DATA PROCEDURES

> International comparisons in the field have been labeled complicated, not only by differences in objectives and in meanings of the words used to describe programs, but most of all, because of the contextuality of existing programs. (Gibb, 1993, p. 11-12).

The study is qualitative and the overall design is comparative. Answers for the research questions were sought first within each country context and then in comparison of the findings of the two other countries. The sample of the study consists of written texts: both relevant formal and informal texts. The data was selected from those texts, which either directly or indirectly address the problem of this study. The aim was to find texts in all three countries to represent as many different positions in the debate as possible. This study, however, does not claim to cover all the arguments concerning entrepreneurial education, but to present major categories of ways of seeing it. A close reading and analysis were employed for data from the national discourses. Relevant arguments in each national context were organized using phenomenographic method. Finally, social cartography was used to represent the results of the argument analysis in order to present the debate in the form of an intertextual field as a map.

The basic idea of phenomenography is that each phenomenon can be experienced or conceptualized in a limited number of qualitatively different ways, and it is the task of phenomenography to map these possible understandings. (Marton, 1988, p.196.) Through empirical studies as well as textual analysis, phenomenographic studies seek not to describe things "as they are," but how they have been presented as sedimentations of ways of thinking about the world. Categories of description identified in phenomenographic research are seen as a form of discovery and as the main outcomes of such inquiry. (Paulston, 1996a, pp. 20-21.) Marton (1988, p. 180) points out, that with this approach "we end up with categories of description, that though originating from a contextual understanding (interpretation), are decontextualized and, hence, can be used in contexts other than the original one." This makes the approach particularly helpful in my study, overcoming the difficulty mentioned before, which has prevented the international comparisons in the field till now. It enables the researcher to make the final comparison and analysis between the national discourses.

Social cartography is a new method that allows the comparison of multiple realities and contested codes in heuristic constructs. It helps comparative educators to order and interpret the relativism and fragmentation of our time. This study was not trying to solve the problem of how to organize entrepreneurial education, but rather how to identify ways to see entrepreneurial education in textual discourse in terms of definitions and rationales, and how the different discovered ways of seeing might be categorized and patterned to advance understanding. In addition, it sought to assess the utility of the new social cartographic method. The findings of argument analysis in each country were summarized in a phenomenographic map that enables the reader to visualize the intertextual space and relations of the national debates. The maps from national debates were further analyzed and used as the basis for international comparison.

In the following I will give a brief summary of each country case concentrating on findings for the second research question displaying what kind of rationales are given for entrepreneurial education.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The American society has shifted from an industrial economy to an information and service economy. Small businesses are now leading the way in job creation, innovation and productivity. Entrepreneurship is viewed as viable strategy to revitalize the economy. Therefore, interest and promotion of entrepreneurship education has surged, and support has come from many directions. In this chapter I will discuss entrepreneurship education in the United States. My purpose is to describe how the selected texts studied portray the discourse on rationales for it. In the actual study I reviewed literature describing the historical foundation as well as the cultural context for this phenomenon and the entrepreneurship education concept.

The United States was founded on the premises of the free enterprise. The immigrants who came to this country were entrepreneurial spirits. The American dream is to be one's own boss. The latest extensive Gallup survey on entrepreneurship and small business (1994) found out that independence, not monetary gain, is today the main motivation to start one's own business. The survey also identified the general appreciation for entrepreneurship and the interest for entrepreneurship education. Yet surprising finding in the study was that the overall entrepreneurial knowledge is quite poor.

Entrepreneurship is a relatively new topic in US education dating back only to the beginning of the 1980s. Entrepreneurship education still remains mysterious to the general public. Gibb (1993, p. 29) has summarized that "entrepreneurship education in the United States clearly has as its prime objective the creation of awareness, understanding of and motivation toward independent business ownership".

The second research question calls for investigation of the discourse on rationales for entrepreneurship education. In this study it was fulfilled with the analysis of arguments found in relevant

texts. These texts were then organized into categories according to the methodology explained in the earlier chapter. The goal of this study was to find different categories of ways of seeing, not to cover all the arguments or the whole debate. The element of analysis was rather an argument than the whole text. The texts that were selected to illustrate the categories were organized in terms of their positions on dimensions of supporting—opposing entrepreneurship education and whether the concern is improvement of individual—society.

The selected texts were first divided to either supporting or opposing texts. Then both text piles were considered in terms of their target. This way four different sections were reached:

-Support Entrepreneurship Education for Societal Improvement

-Support Entrepreneurship Education for Individual's Self-improvement

-Oppose Entrepreneurship Education Out of Concern for the Society

-Oppose Entrepreneurship Education Out of Concern for the Individual

The third research question calls for visual display of the intertextual space of debate. Because the purpose of the map is to help the reader to understand the phenomenon, it is quite justified to present the map before the discussion of the discourse. The debate in the United States is portrayed in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Discourse Communities for US Entrepreneurship Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The arguments supporting entrepreneurship education that were concerned with the societal improvements – found in the upper right quadrangle in figure 1—can be divided to three groups: global, national and local. The focus on global arguments is still national but from the foreign policy perspective. The major concern is competitiveness and survival in the global community. The national arguments are predominantly concerned about the nation's economic efficiency. The exception is the social development argument claiming that entrepreneurship education carries much higher societal benefit than just generating new business. However, the concern there is also in what is best for the society. The local arguments are represented in this study not necessarily local in the geographic sense. These arguments are still concerned with the gain of the society, but from a group perspective. They can be further categorized as empowerment and socializing tool arguments. The discovered texts stated that ethnic groups, ever since the first immigrants who came to the United States, adjusted better to entrepreneurship than the general population. The need for entrepreneurship education among the ethnic groups is mainly for fine tuning. The main task is to tackle the challenge with the African American population: The facts speaking against black entrepreneurship need dramatic correction. According to the texts many young African Americans are really anxious to start a business, but they don't have the access and the skills to do it. An example of how specific the discourse in the US society can be, the arguments for using entrepreneurship education as a socializing tool to enhance environmental education and Christian capitalism, are presented.

The core of supporting arguments for an individual's self-improvement, presented in the upper left corner on the map, are the youth self-reliance arguments. These are the arguments that most entrepreneurship education programs include in their mission statements. As a sign of the level of detail in the discourse, a single argument was found declaring the rationale for entrepreneurship education for gifted students. Entrepreneurship education for disadvantaged youth, instead, has recently become a recommended activity in many entrepreneurship education publications. At-risk students need entrepreneurship education as a tool for survival. Disadvantaged young people are willing to start on a shoestring and do all the hard work, whereas middle-class kids expect to start another Apple computer business. A special disadvantaged group in terms of entrepreneurship is girls. Traditionally business opportunities have been open for males; boys have been encouraged to seek opportunities from early on. Women are much more cautious than men in starting a business, therefore they need the extra push and support to do that. Girls need mentors and education to fight the gender inequalities and uncertainties they face. Even though it is most commonly known that the children of entrepreneurs have the best chance of becoming entrepreneurs, the area of entrepreneurship education for family business has long been neglected. It is not necessarily clear that the transition between generations happens. And when it does

happen it is not well known how. Therefore, the need for entrepreneurship education for family business has been addressed.

The opposing arguments from the society perspective, portrait on the lower right quadrangle on the map, are mainly demonstrations against the capitalist approach to run the society. The fact that entrepreneurship education is still rather a new phenomenon, and that it is fuzzy in its theoretical origin, has left the critics somewhat unarmed. However, bringing the business values to school in the first place was an alarming progress. The New Right values, which entrepreneurship education has been claimed to represent, have been foreseen to cause individual competition, consumerism, and educational inequalities. This again would increase the bifurcation of society in terms of class race and gender. A surprising category found from the literature might be a particular corporate leader's argument, which states that entrepreneurship education is too empowering. The historical review in the beginning of this chapter reminded us of the fact that business leaders expected schools to educate obedient and skillful workers and not innovative entrepreneurial types. In addition they don't want their best workers to become entrepreneurs and start their own businesses. Nevertheless, corporate leaders might be supportive to the idea of intrapreneurship, i.e. corporate entrepreneurship or internal entrepreneurship, as a part of the entrepreneurial education if they are informed about it.

The categorization and the visual presentation of the investigation, the map, represent my interpretation of the entrepreneurship education discourse in the United States. As an individual, I don't see myself as an active player on this field in the United States, rather an observer. As the creator of the map, I locate my text, this chapter, as the platform for this map.

ENTERPRISE EDUCATION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

According to Stephens (1991), the British still often hold to the romanticized vision of an entrepreneur, a vision dating to the initial phases of the Industrial Revolution. Traditionally the term entrepreneur would be associated with successful manufacturers and lords of commerce. In the UK the will to be adventurous can easily be discouraged by the attitudes of the society - the influence of the welfare state, together with the attitudes in general to an individual's right to security. People had come to lead a very comfortable post-war existence in which they were cared for by a benevolent state from cradle to grave and, therefore risk-taking, in an atmosphere where there was not a rescuer close by, was an unfamiliar concept for them. In Britain one failure marks an end to that kind of life, forever. The British do not take failure well and are prone to be unforgiving, because societal attitudes have encouraged them to become over-careful. The main motivation for British entrepreneurs is self-interest, but the fact is that much of the activity is not truly wealth creating anymore.

In this chapter I will concentrate on the rationales for enterprise education in the United Kingdom, which will also be referred to here as Britain. Technically, Britain is composed of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. The discussion here, however, concentrates particularly on England and Wales, because Scotland and Northern Ireland have a separate educational system, and their approach to enterprise education differs from that of England and Wales. In the study I reviewed the context of enterprise education by describing the historical, political and social background to the education-economy relationship and then outlined the recent school reforms from the perspective which this study is concerned. After briefly illustrating how entrepreneurship is perceived in the UK and how it is represented in the society, the conceptualization for enterprise education is unfolded. For this presentation the debate of enterprise education rationales will be discussed and mapped.

Community education, management education, progressive education and the education for capability movement have been mentioned in the literature as antecedents for enterprise education. The first discernible context for enterprise education can be found in the schools-industry movement. The texts show that the attitudes of young people toward enterprise and small business are positive. Even though the Scott and Twomey (1988) survey revealed significant interest in entrepreneurship, it also revealed a lack of knowledge about how small firms enter the marketplace and operate.

The term used in the United Kingdom and in much of Europe is enterprise education and it is focused on personal attributes. Enterprise education is not necessarily meant only for business context. There are two key approaches that many constituents share. Caird (1990) has suggested defining enterprise education as being divided into three separate categories: education *for* enterprise, education *about* enterprise and education *through* enterprise. Watts (1984) divides enterprise education into two broad groups of activities within the education *for* enterprise movement. The first group is concerned with the implementation of setting up a business largely set outside educational institutions and contexts. The second group is concerned with awareness rising in young people in educational institutions of the possibilities and excitement of creating their own work. (Watts, 1984, p. 6.)

The second research question focuses on the debate around the given rationales on enterprise education on the British literature. Again the problem was approached according to the given framework as explained in the previous chapter. Most of the arguments found in the UK are supportive to enterprise education; after all, it has served the goals of the official national policies of the contemporary governments. In addition, the awakening of enterprise education coincided with the introduction of national curriculum. The debate in the United Kingdom is portrayed in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Discourse Communities for UK Enterprise Education

There is a strong sense in the British literature that there is a need to do everything to keep up with the economic competition in the world. After all, Britain has a history of being a key player in the global marketplace, and therefore, the interests of remaining on the top of the world's economic development is strong. These arguments are displayed in the upper right quadrangle on the map. The main response in Britain to growing international economic competition has been to reform the structure and curricular content of British schooling as a means of restructuring the national economy. National companies and business communities were also strong supporters of promoting enterprise culture and enterprise education in the country. Yet some scholars pointed out that their interests were not solely altruistic: They knew that their very existence depends on helping young people into self-employment and small business. In their supporting role many representatives even became active players in the promotion work. As another layer, several multinational companies based in the UK have initiated international policies regarding promoting enterprise through education. One well-documented example is the involvement of the British Petrol (BP) company in the education systems wherever it operates. Furthermore, since British education institutions have come up with packaged programs in enterprise

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

education, they are ready and willing to transmit the gospel of enterprise to the rest of the world. Being enterprising themselves, they have found markets in eastern European courtries as well as in developing countries.

As seen in the map, the concentration of the supportive arguments has been located in the societal improvement quadrangle. Of course the possible relief for the high youth unemployment and the new requirements of the workforce made enterprise education attractive also on the individual level; students, their parents, teachers and general public became interested. However, because the official government approach supported the promotion of enterprise education, there has been necessary need for a particular promotion literature for youth self-reliance to be that extensive. It is taken as granted. As Gibson (1994), a faculty member in one of the key program developers, Durham University Business School (DUBS), points out, the "very essence of enterprise education is designed to change young people individually to become more enterprising".

As support was concentrated on the societal issues so seems the opposition be. In Britain, where there is a long tradition of critical scholars and where the labor unions are strong, the new education reform, with the emphasis on enterprise culture and economic development, received vast criticism. The political home of enterprise education was debated, but many scholars argued that there could be found a consensus that it was seen as "an arm of a Conservative government's attempt at an ideological revolution' (Coffield, 1990; Curran, 1991; Ritchie, 1991). Several scholars question the very existence and content of enterprise education and consider it mainly as a political tool (Caird, 1990; Harris, 1993; Law, 1990). Weir (1986) goes even further and points out that much of enterprise education is just packaging marketing, accounting, personnel work and business studies in a new way. This provides an opportunity to certain experts to protect their own job. The fact that there is such confusion about the concept of enterprise education and the content of it causes suspicion, or even opposition, among educators. Enterprise education is seen as promoting capitalism and that has made educators and the general public uneasy. Teachers don't want to be seen as training young people to capitalism. Related to the reluctance of promoting capitalism is the concern that enterprise education with values from the market place and competition would weaken equality and social justice. This is, of course, related to the simultaneous weakening of the welfare state. In the global context, Carmen (1995) calls for the re-evaluation of social responsibility and ethical values in the western business and enterprise. He warns us about being imperialistic and dehumanizing the people in developing countries by training them for the western type of business values. Weir (1986) claims that enterprise education includes false promise by stating that "much of it is training in business techniques which does not liberate the individual to be self regulating as good education should do."

Again, as with the United States, I don't see myself as an active part of the United Kingdom map. As the creator of the map, my text, this chapter, gives the platform for the map.

ENTERPRISE EDUCATION IN FINLAND

In this chapter I will discuss the debate on enterprise education in Finland based on the relevant available literature. Enterprise education has become pertinent in Finland with the rapid changes in the country's economy. In Finland, education has traditionally been held in high value, and its significance for the development of the society and the economy is generally acknowledged. Entrepreneurship, on the other hand, has for a long time been undervalued in the society. In the chapter this background got proportionally more space than in the previous two, because enterprise education has just started in Finland and its seeking its place in the society and there is a great need to approach this new idea analytically.

In 1991 the Finnish economy experienced a severe recession. Political and economic upheaval in the USSR greatly reduced demand for Finnish exports there, while the market for forestry products and paper also diminished elsewhere. A rapid increase in business failures and unemployment occurred. All this brought entrepreneurship into light as one possible remedy for the situation.

The educational system in Finland is facing vast changes with its decentralization. Schools will have more say in their own curriculum and also in their own administration. The municipalities have been granted more decision-making power in a situation of decreasing resources. The National Board of Education only lays down the guidelines for educational planning, and on this basis, the schools can draw up their own plans. The decentralization of the curriculum can also mean that subject matter will be more closely linked to local needs including those of industry and business.

Finland does not have a strong history in entrepreneurship. First of all, the Finnish perceptions about entrepreneurship have not been encouraging. However, the latest survey on young people's attitudes in Finland reveals that young people have now more positive attitudes towards entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship than in recent years. Most of the young people believe in their opportunity to succeed as entrepreneurs and that succeeding is up to them. They also appreciate entrepreneurs, who are considered important in creating new jobs and being responsible employers. Second, there have been numerous obstacles for entrepreneurs in Finland. The bureaucratic and taxation burdens have been too heavy for many to even consider entrepreneurship. The negative perceptions and the obstacles in entrepreneurship have now been acknowledged in the Finnish society and correcting matters has already started. The government and the president of the country have admitted the problems and promised to do all in their power to improve the position of entrepreneurs in the society. One of the most ambitious and overall

efforts in the Finnish history is the Enterprise Decade Project, which was launched in 1995 to unite the efforts to promote entrepreneurship and a more enterprising culture in Finland.

Even though entrepreneurship is currently a buzz word in the Finnish society, enterprise education as a concept has remained unknown, mainly because in practice it is still so undeveloped. In Finland Peltonen (1986) has divided entrepreneurship into internal and external entrepreneurship. Every Finnish definition for entrepreneurial education (today almost uniformly called enterprise education) uses this definition as a base. In Finland the activity is called enterprise education, following the English model, rather than entrepreneurship education, and it is seen to consist of two parts: education for internal and external entrepreneurship. Learning for the internal entrepreneurship has been a commonly accepted goal for general education in terms of creating enterprising individuals, whereas learning for the external entrepreneurship could be implemented in schools specializing in enterprise education. One of the macro level goals is to change the Finnish society toward more of an enterprising culture.

Typical to the Finnish debate climate is not to have a vast open debate on issues which are promoted by the government and "commonly accepted" by the citizens. The arguments found in Finnish texts were organized into categories in the same manner as in previous chapters. The visual display of the intertextual space of debate called by the third research question is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Discourse Communities for Finnish Enterprise Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the Finnish discourse studied, the most dominant arguments concentrate in the space of supporting arguments for the economic development in the society. The national arguments strongly advise that enterprise education is a direction that the nation's education system and schools have to explore to build the future of the country. With the decentralization in education the municipalities have shared the responsibilities, and therefore, many of their supporting arguments can be found in the local perspective. At this point I could not find many favorable arguments for an individual's self-improvement. I think that since enterprise education is still at the pilot stage in Finland it is difficult to promote something that one does not know enough about. Some examples of promoting enterprise education based on experience in other countries could be found, but they were excluded from this study. A representation of supportive arguments for youth self-improvement, which I would predict to be seen more of in the future, are the few arguments from program providers, youth constituents and supporting entrepreneurs.

The opposing arguments are mainly concerned with the threats enterprise education casts upon social justice and equality or the false promise that this approach is seen to represent. However, also entrepreneurs' comments could be found among the opposition. Some entrepreneurs have indicated that their expectation from the school system is to educate and train competent workers for their businesses. One father, who is also an educator, raises the point that there has to be something that could be criticized in enterprise education. He claims the promotion of it has reached the status of a religion like ideology and that public debate on the topic is needed.

As a Finnish citizen and an educator I do have an opinion about this debate. I do agree with the father that more debate and research is needed. However, I do see the value of enterprise education for its positive impact on the country's economy, but even more so, I see enterprise education, in the form that it is understood in Finland, as a survival method for young people in today's world of uncertainty. Therefore, I see that, as a researcher of this topic, I do have a place in this debate as an active player, and hence my position can be found on the map.

THE FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The final comparison in the study consisted of comparing the three contexts, the differences and similarities in the concepts, and the rationales given to entrepreneurial education. For the purpose of this presentation the comparison will focus on the juxtaposition of the rationales found in the textual debates.

In all three countries, the United States, the United Kingdom and Finland a free market economy is the dominant metaphor underlying the new developments. The educational reforms in these countries spring from the same pressures to become economically more competitive. Particularly in the US and the UK, education had been blamed to fail in its duty. In Britain and in Finland two major factors to trigger

enterprise education were high unemployment (in the UK particularly, youth unemployment) and the break down of the welfare state. In all three countries there developed new ideological climates as a response to the failing policies of the liberal governments. The election of Conservative and Republican governments in the UK and the US and a right wing government in Finland brought policies shaped by a mix of neo-liberal and neo-conservative ideas to which the label New Right has been given. The reforms became realized in the US and in the UK during the eighties and in Finland a decade later. Each country has adopted changes that appear to be similar in content but different in approach. Each has made its changes within existing unique national educational and political frameworks. The United Kingdom, where education policy is subject to relatively high central government control, there has been enacted a uniform and encompassing set of education reform, policies. The United States, with a far more decentralized set of governmental arrangements for education, has proceeded in ad hoc, state-by-state manner. Finland is now in a new situation balancing between these two. Traditionally, with a strong centralized system, the new societal requirements and reforms coincide with introducing decentralization in education.

Figure 4. The Three Entrepreneurial Education Maps

US

UK

FIN

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As a finding of this study and an answer to the third research question, the debates in each country were illustrated in form of an intertextual map. The maps are a representation of my categorization of the relevant texts dealing with rationales for entrepreneurial education in these three countries. The maps provide us now with a visual tool and easy access to begin the comparison of the debates. When comparing the images it is easy to realize that the space in the US map is most occupied and most evenly covered, whereas the Finnish map seems to be most empty. In the US map, the clouds, which represent the categories, seem to include more subcategories than the clouds in the other two maps. In this particular mapping, the US map has 12 main categories and 8 subcategories; the UK map has 9 main categories and 2 subcategories while Finnish map has only 7 categories. These factors could be interpreted that the debate in the US is more diverse than in the other two countries. It is easy to comprehend that the Finnish map has more vacant space than the other two, since enterprise education is a new phenomenon that started in Finland only in 1993 and is still more or less in its pilot stage. But, even more so, knowing the culture of the country, it is not a surprise. As explained in the Finnish chapter, it is typical to the "debate" climate of such a homogeneous and small nation, not to have a vast open debate on issues which are promoted by the government and generally accepted by the citizens. The clouds/categories in the UK and Finnish maps seem to concentrate more toward the society end of the space. This can be explained by the fact that since these two societies have a long tradition of centralized governments, and these reforms were introduced particularly to benefit the nation states, the debates obviously would concentrate on the societal factors. The size of the clouds is not directly representational to the volume of arguments but does include a hint in that direction. In each map the national cloud is the biggest, suggesting that the national category has the most arguments. Also, the national cloud is the relatively largest in the UK and larger in Finland than it is in the US map representing the proportion of the national approach. In the US the youth self-reliance cloud is more or less the same size with the national cloud. This gives us the idea that in the United States, the support for individual rationales is as important as the support for the society rational. Each map has its unique categories represented, like the family business and women owned business in the US, the strong political opposition categories in the UK, and the local municipality category in Finland. These issues might be represented as well in the other discourses, but at least they are not as visible or easily accessed. Race and ethnic rationales are relevant in the US and UK, but do not apply in Finland. Furthermore, in each map the proportion of support arguments is larger than the proportion of the opposition. This can be explained by the fact that, in general, entrepreneurial education has a bigger variety of supporting arguments than hindering ones.

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the reported study was to gather information on entrepreneurial education concepts and map the debates in three countries, the United States, the United Kingdom and Finland. The goal of the study was to enhance understanding of the entrepreneurial education in general, and in these countries in particular. In the following I will review the conclusions that can be made from the findings in reference to the research questions posed in the beginning of this paper.

The concept of entrepreneurial education was an operational term framed in this study to serve as an umbrella term for entrepreneurial activity in formal education in these country contexts. In the United States the activity is called entrepreneurship education, whereas in the United Kingdom and in Finland, it is called enterprise education. (Actually in Finland the debate about the terminology is in Finnish and there is confusion regarding the proper translation.) There is no overall consensus over the terminology in the literature in any one of these contexts as there is no consensus over the concepts and terminology related to entrepreneurship. However, I concluded based on my findings from the texts that the concept of entrepreneurial education is best seen contextually. As it appears in the current literature, entrepreneurship education in the United States is more directly focused upon small business and entrepreneurship, whereas enterprise education in the United Kingdom and Finland is aimed at the development of enterprising behavior, skills and attributes, not only for business use.

The comparison of the debates on the rationales for the entrepreneurial education showed how all the three debates were different. Yet all the discourses shared also similar characteristics. Each one of the maps showed that in every context there are multiple perspectives in the debate. Even though enterprise education in Finland seems to be an issue promoted only by the government to benefit the nation, the map shows that there are both other supportive arguments but also opposing arguments that are typical to Finnish culture which would be marginalized in the public discourse. The debate is the most diverse in the US where the society is multicultural and diversity is not only part of the culture but also the way to do decentralized policy. The debates in the UK and in Finland appear to be more resembling. Both countries had a centralized approach to reforms for enterprise education. Yet the British debate includes global arguments, since the UK is a more serious player in the global market place than Finland, whose recent admission to the European Union made international trade issues more concrete to Finnish businesses. The sharpest and most drastic opposition can be found in the UK, which does not show adequately on the map. To verify this, one has to go back to the actual arguments quoted in the study. The mapping of the debates also indirectly reveals the players on the debate. One has to, however, go back to the building blocks of the maps, the quoted arguments, to see which groups have been writing about the phenomenon or which groups are written about. The map itself does not reveal the actors, because the same groups might have different arguments about the same issue. One example of groups whose arguments can be found in several categories is the teachers.

The methodology of this study builds on the theory and practice of social cartography. The pioneering works of Paulston, Liebman and Nicholson-Goodman in the University of Pittsbugh Social Cartography project were foundational for my research. *Social Cartography* (Paulston, 1996b) introduces several mapping projects that make comparisons on the map level. However, based on my research and literature review, this study is the first attempt to use social cartography as a method for mapping national policy debates. This study uses three different maps, which actually are already comparisons, for the bases of international comparison and therefore it actually employs metamapping.

This study shows the usefulness and also the limitations of social cartography in comparing national debates with multiple perspectives. As discussed in the previous chapter, mapping provides a useful visual tool to easily access complex issues. In addition the method is ideal to kick off the comparison. However, at least at this point in the methodological development, it is wise to warn against solely "trusting the maps" as a basis of informed comparison. Mapping is only a representation and it simplifies a complex issue. As learned in this study, there are important issues, which cannot be fully illustrated by mapping the different categories in the debate (for example, the power of the opposition in the British case). Therefore, it is recommendable that, for deeper analysis, maps should be interpreted together with the selected arguments represented on the map.

One major finding from the mapping has been to visualize and realize the diversity and multiple perspectives in the debates. Extensive policy borrowing and the interconnectedness of entrepreneurial education and globalization are findings that I had expected and sought to point out and problematize with this research. Instead of "blind" policy borrowing, I am proposing mapping of ideas from multiple sources and locations. An unexpected finding that occurred to me when I was comparing the results from three discourses is the importance of the leadership role of a few higher education institutions. That would make a topic for an interesting future study.

An assessment of the use of the social cartography method for comparing national debates suggests, that this method enables a visual comparison, a task that was claimed in the literature to be difficult, if not impossible. In other words, the maps proved to be useful visual tools to access complex issues. Mapping also offers space for a further opening of dialogue. One purpose of mapping is also to challenge the reader to do his/her own mapping, either by going back to the textual arguments presented in the study, or by collecting his/her own collection of arguments. The presented maps in this study represent my interpretation of the written works that I have selected as relevant texts based on my professional knowledge and research. In the case of entrepreneurial education, social cartography has provided a methodology to address the phenomenon, which has been claimed in the literature to be extremely complex, and almost impossible to compare internationally. Even though there is no consensus

of the concept of entrepreneurship or enterprise I would argue that mapping has helped increase understanding of the phenomenon.

REFERENCES

Block, Z., & Stumpf, S. A. (1992). Entrepreneurship education research: Experience and challenge. In D. L. Sexton & J. D. Kasarda (Eds.), *The state of the art of entrepreneurship* (pp. 17-42). Boston: PWS-Kent.

Caird, S. (1990). Enterprise education: The need for differentiation. *British Journal of Education and Work, 4*(1), 47-57.

Carmen, R. (1995). Workshop for enterprise management vs. "British" enterprise education: The difference is in the context. *Convergence, 28*(1), 72-88.

Coffield, F. (1990). From the decade of the enterprise culture to the decade of the TEC. *British Journal of Education and Work, 4*(1), 68-80.

Curran, J. (1991). Foreword. In R. Burrows (Ed.), *Deciphering the Enterprise Culture: Entrepreneurship, Petty Capitalism and the Restructuring of Britain* . London: Routledge.

Gallup Organization and National Center for Research in Economic Education. (1994). *Entrepreneurship and small business in the United States: A survey report on the views of the general public, high school students, and small business owners and managers* . Kansas City, MO: Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership.

Gibb, A. (1993). The enterprise culture and education. *International Small Business Journal, 11*(3), 11-34.

Gibson, A. (1994). Freirean versus enterprise education: The difference is in the business. *Convergence, 27*(1), 46-56.

Gunderson, G. (1990). Thinking about entrepreneurs: Models, assumptions, and evidence. In A. Kent (Ed.), *Entrepreneurship Education* . Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Harris, A. (1993). Evaluating enterprise in higher education. *Assesment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 18*(3), 167-175.

Law, B. (1990). Deconstructing the enterprise culture. *British Journal of Guidance and Councelling, 18*(2), 201-208.

Mahlberg, T. (1995). *Team venture as a new teaching and learning method in entrepreneurial education.* Paper presented at the IntEnt95, International Entrepreneurship Conference, Sydney, Australia.

Marton, F. (1988). Phenomenography: Exploring different conceptions of reality. New York: Praeger. In D. Fetterman (Ed.), *Qualitative Approaches to Evaluation in Education* (pp. 176-205). New York: Praeger.

Noll, C. L. (1993). Planning curriculum for entrepreneurship education. *Business Education Forum*(February), 3-5.

Paulston, R., G. (1996a). Mapping knowledge perspectives in studies of social and educational change. In R. G. Paulston, M. Liebman, W., & J. Nicholson-Goodman (Eds.), *Mapping multiple perspectives: Research reports of the University of Pittsburgh social cartography project, 1993-1996* (pp. 1-35). Pittsburgh: Department of Administrative and Policy Studies in Education.

Paulston, R. G. (Ed.). (1996b). *Social cartography: Mapping ways of seeing social and educational change*. New York: Garland.

Peltonen, M. (1986). *Yrittäjyys [Entrepreneurship]*. Keuruu: Otava.

Ritchie, J. (1991). Chasing shadows: Enterprise Culture as educational phenomenon. *Journal of Educational Policy, 6*(3), 315-325.

Scott, M.F. & Twomey, D.F. (1988). The longterm supply of entrepreneurs: Students' career aspirations in relation to entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management,* 26(4), 5-13.

Stephens, M. D. (1991). Entrepreneurs. In M. D. Stephens (Ed.), *Education and entrepreneurs* (pp. 9-23). Nottingham: The Department of Adult Education, University of Nottingham.

Timmons, J. (1995). *New Venture Creation*. (4th ed.). Boston: Irwin.

Watts, A. G. (1984). Education for enterprise: The concept and the context. In A. G. Watts & P. Moran (Eds.), *Education for Enterprise* (pp. 3-6). Cambridge: CRAC/Hobson.

Weir, D. (1986). *Reflections on the Conference*. Paper presented at the CRAC/NICEC, Cambridge.